



09-24-03

EV301787468US

\$40/2175

#11  
10-20-03  
B.J.H

**Certificate Of Mailing By "Express Mail"**

I hereby certify that this correspondence and its attachments are being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service "EXPRESS MAIL Post Office To Addressee" service under 37 C.F.R. §1.10, Mailing Label Certificate No. EV301787468US, on September 22, 2003, addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

**RECEIVED**

OCT 01 2003

Respectfully submitted,

By: Thomas L. Evans  
Thomas L. Evans, PTO Reg. No. 35,805  
BANNER AND WITCOFF, LTD.

Technology Center 2100

Atty. Docket No.  
005156.00012

PATENT

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Patent Application of:

Timothy Joel BROWN

Examiner: H. Mahmoudi

U.S. Pat. App. No.: 09/625,991

Group Art Unit: 2175

Filed: July 26, 2002

For: A SYSTEM FOR USING A FLOATING PALLET FOR A DIGITAL ASSET  
MANAGEMENT SYSTEM IN A PLURALITY OF DIFFERENT APPLICATIONS

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:



Applicant respectfully asks for reconsideration of the above-identified application and the Office Action of May 22, 2003. A response to this Office Action was due by August 22, 2003. Accordingly, Applicant is also concurrently filing a Petition for a one month extension of time, along with authorization for the Commissioner to charge the associated small-entity Petition fee of \$55 to Deposit Account 19-0733. Please consider this Request as timely filed.



RECEIVED

OCT 01 2003

Technology Center 2100

U.S. Pat. App. No.: 09/625,991  
Atty. Docket No.: 005156.00012

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103 over U.S. Patent No. 6,167,395 to Beck et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,918,228 to Rich et al., and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,915,250 to Jain et al. Applicant respectfully traverse this rejection, and courteously urge its reconsideration.

Claims 1 and 2 recite the creation of “a single extension plug in to interface with API’s of all of [a] plurality of different applications.” This feature is not taught or suggested by the Beck et al. patent. The Beck et al. patent describes a multimedia communication system that includes a variety of different functions, including, for example, switch-connected CTI processors, IVR’s, and other related equipment host instances. As noted by the Examiner, the Beck et al. patent also discloses a “dialog box” (see column 34, lines 32-34). In particular, the Beck et al. patent notes that

...a title row 289 comprises column headers and a link to a pop-up editing window that provides for entering steps and necessary parameters. The pop-up window in a preferred embodiment has input fields for entering task numbers, specific action for the task, sequence and pre-requisites related to other tasks, allotted time to complete, and notification parameters, as well as a Cancel and Save function. Through the input window a programmer can design and relate all tasks and sub-steps intended for a process. (*Id.*, lines 32-41.)

The Examiner has suggested that “the floating pallet’ is read on [sic] ‘pop-up editing window...” (See Office Action, page 2, lines 13-14.) Applicant respectfully refutes this suggestion.

There is no teaching or suggestion in the Beck et al. patent that the pop-up editing window can “float” over (i.e., be displayed in conjunction with) multiple applications. Moreover, the Examiner has not referred to a teaching or suggestion in the Beck et al. patent that would



U.S. Pat. App. No.: 09/625,991  
Atty. Docket No.: 005156.00012

indicate that the pop-up editing window can concurrently interface to multiple applications, as recited the claims.

Accordingly, Applicant again submits that the Beck et al. patent does not teach or suggest the floating pallet recited in the claims. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that this omission of the Beck et al. patent is not remedied by either the Rich et al. patent or the Jain et al patent. Applicant therefore asks that the rejection of claims 1 and 2 over the combination of the Beck et al, Rich et al. and Jain et al. patents be withdrawn.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims are allowable, and that this application is therefore in condition for allowance.

Favorable action in this regard is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

By: Thomas L. Evans  
Thomas L. Evans, Reg. No. 35,805  
1001 G Street, N.W., 11<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597  
Telephone: (202) 508-9100  
Facsimile: (202) 508-9299

September 22, 2003

**RECEIVED**

OCT 01 2003

Technology Center 2100